



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/555,407

06/08/2007

Dale L. Ludwig

X-18524

7544

25885 7590 08/03/2009
ELI LILLY & COMPANY
PATENT DIVISION
P.O. BOX 6288
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46206-6288

EXAMINER

BLANCHARD, DAVID J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1643

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/03/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@lilly.com

| | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. 10/555,407 | Applicant(s) LUDWIG, DALE L. | |
| | Examiner David J. Blanchard | Art Unit 1643 | |

All Participants:

(1) David J. Blanchard.

(2) Sanjay M. Jivraj.

Status of Application: Reply to restriction filed 5/28/09

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 28 July 2009

Time: 10:05 AM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None of record

Claims discussed:

12-14, 23-33 and 57-60

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/David J Blanchard/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1643

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed proposed amendments to claims 57-58 to recite "An isolated antibody or fragment thereof..." to obviate a rejection under 35 USC 101 as being drawn to non-statutory subject matter and to remove the language "represented by" to obviate an indefiniteness rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Also, discussed proposed amendments to claims 59-60 to place the claims in proper dependent form (MPEP 608.01(n)). Further, the sequences disclosed in Figures 1-14 are embraced by the sequence rules and require sequence identifiers either in the Brief Description of the Drawings or in the Drawings. See MPEP 2422.02. Finally, the preliminary amendment to the specification filed 11/1/05 was acknowledged, however, applicant was advised that replacement paragraphs 0001 and 0081 do not include markings (e.g., underlining the added text, strike-through or double brackets of any text deleted) to show all of the changes relative to the previous version of the paragraphs. Applicant agreed to make the proposed amendments to place the instant application in better form for allowance in the interest of compact prosecution. .